From Athens to Marx

The Intellectual Genealogy of Marxism

How Western Civilization Built the Theorist

Thomas J. Bryan

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that Karl Marx did not invent Marxism so much as synthesize it—drawing together intellectual threads that had been developing within Western civilization for centuries, often millennia, before he was born. Every major element of Marxist theory had already been part of the Western intellectual inheritance: materialism from the Greek pre-Socratics, dialectical thinking from Heraclitus, class struggle from the Roman Republic, the labor theory of value from John Locke and David Ricardo, the critique of inequality from Rousseau, and the revolutionary tradition from the French Revolution. The one element Marx borrowed that is least often recognized—and arguably the most consequential—was the narrative structure itself. The eschatological framework of Marxism (primitive innocence, the Fall into exploitation, suffering under capitalism, revolutionary salvation, and the advent of a classless society) is structurally identical to the Judeo-Christian narrative of Eden, the Fall, exile, messianic deliverance, and the Kingdom of God. Marx secularized this story completely, replacing God with historical materialism and Christ with the proletariat, but the narrative architecture remained unchanged.

By tracing these threads from their origins through the dual infrastructure of Western civilization—the Athens path of secular reason and the Jerusalem path of religious revelation—this paper establishes that Marxism was not a foreign contamination or a sudden invention but the natural culmination of traditions already embedded in Western culture. Marx was the synthesizer, not the originator. Understanding this genealogy matters because it reveals why Marxism carried such extraordinary psychological power: it combined the intellectual authority of Enlightenment science with the emotional architecture of a salvation narrative that Western societies had internalized over two thousand years.

Keywords: Marxism, dual infrastructure, materialism, dialectics, eschatology, labor theory of value, class struggle, intellectual genealogy, Athens path, Jerusalem path

---

I. INTRODUCTION: THE PUZZLE OF MARXISM'S ORIGINS

The Conventional Narrative and Its Problem

How do we explain the emergence of Marxism? The most common framing treats Karl Marx as a revolutionary thinker who, through sheer intellectual force, produced a comprehensive theory of human history, economics, and social organization that would reshape the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In this telling, Marx stands as inventor—the singular genius who synthesized German idealism, French socialism, and British political economy into something genuinely new. The Communist Manifesto of 1848 and Capital of 1867 appear as ruptures in intellectual history, works so original that they require no explanation beyond Marx's own remarkable capacity.

This narrative is understandable but historically inaccurate. It treats Marx as if he operated in a vacuum, when in fact every major element of his theory had already been developed—sometimes centuries earlier—within the traditions he inherited. Materialism was not Marx's invention; it had been articulated by Greek philosophers twenty-three centuries before he wrote his doctoral dissertation on the subject. Dialectical thinking was not Marx's creation; it had been identified by Heraclitus in the sixth century BCE and systematized by Hegel in Marx's own lifetime. The labor theory of value was not Marx's discovery; it had been proposed by John Locke in 1690 and refined by David Ricardo by 1817. Class struggle was not Marx's concept; it had been institutionalized in Roman politics for two hundred years before the first century CE. The critique of inequality was not Marx's insight; Rousseau had made it the centerpiece of Western political philosophy seventy years before the Communist Manifesto.

What Marx did—and what made his synthesis so extraordinarily powerful—was pull all of these pre-existing threads together into a single, comprehensive system and give them a narrative structure that carried the psychological weight of a salvation story. That narrative structure itself was borrowed, though from an unlikely source: the eschatological framework of Judeo-Christian theology. Marx's account of human history—from primitive communism through the Fall into class society, through the suffering of capitalism, to revolutionary redemption and the advent of communist paradise—is structurally identical to the biblical narrative from Eden through the Fall, through exile and suffering, to messianic deliverance and the Kingdom of God.

This paper traces that genealogy. It follows the threads that became Marxism from their origins in ancient Greece and Rome, through the medieval preservation and Reformation-era resurrection of secular thought, through the Enlightenment philosophers who developed the intellectual toolkit Marx would later deploy, through the French Revolution that established the revolutionary tradition he adopted, and finally to Marx's own synthesis. At each stage, the argument is the same: these ideas were already part of Western civilization's intellectual inheritance. Marx did not conjure them from thin air. He recognized what was already there and assembled it into something that felt—and in many ways was—genuinely new.

The Dual Infrastructure: Why This Genealogy Is Possible

Understanding how Marx could draw on such diverse intellectual sources requires understanding a structural feature that makes Western civilization unique among major

civilizations. Most great civilizations developed around unified cosmological frameworks. Imperial China organized itself around Confucian philosophy, which integrated ethics, governance, and social organization into a comprehensive system. The Islamic world built its civilization on the Quran, which functioned simultaneously as divine revelation, legal code, and constitutional framework. These were single-infrastructure civilizations in which challenging any one dimension of authority meant challenging the entire structure.

Western civilization developed differently. When Constantine integrated Christianity with the Roman Empire in the fourth century, he did not choose between the Greco-Roman secular tradition and the Judeo-Christian religious tradition. He kept both. This created a civilization built on two distinct and potentially competing foundations.

The Jerusalem path drew authority from divine revelation, transmitted through scripture and church hierarchy. Knowledge came through faith and the interpretation of sacred texts. Moral obligations flowed from God's commandments. The church mediated between heaven and earth through sacraments administered by ordained clergy.

The Athens path drew authority from reason and nature, transmitted through philosophical inquiry and legal precedent. Knowledge came through empirical observation and logical deduction. Moral obligations flowed from natural law accessible to human reason. The state enforced rational legal codes developed through deliberation.

The crucial consequence of this dual foundation was that Western civilization embedded two potentially competing sources of legitimate authority. When elite factions fought for power, they could draw on either tradition to justify their claims. Neither path could eliminate the other without destroying the civilization's coherence, because both were indigenous to Western development rather than foreign imports.

This dual infrastructure is precisely what made Marx's synthesis possible. He could draw on the Athens path for materialism, dialectics, secular reason, and class analysis while simultaneously borrowing the Jerusalem path's narrative structure—its eschatological arc from fall through suffering to redemption—without acknowledging the borrowing. The result was an ideology that appeared to be purely secular and scientific while carrying the deep psychological architecture of a religious salvation narrative. Both paths were already inside Western civilization. Marx simply recognized that they could be combined.

The Argument in Brief

This paper establishes a genealogy tracing five threads that converge in Marx's synthesis.

First, Greek philosophy provided the foundations of materialism and dialectical thinking that Marx built upon directly. His doctoral dissertation was literally on the subject of Greek atomist materialism, and he acknowledged the debt throughout his career.

Second, the Roman Republic provided the first sustained institutional experience of class struggle in Western history—two centuries of structured conflict between patricians and plebeians that established class analysis as a framework for understanding political change. Roman law simultaneously developed the secular legal framework that the Enlightenment would later revive and Marx would later critique.

Third, and most importantly, the Judeo-Christian tradition provided the narrative structure that Marx secularized into the eschatological framework of Marxist history. This is the thread that is most often overlooked and most consequential for understanding why Marxism carried the psychological force it did.

Fourth, Enlightenment philosophy—particularly Locke's labor theory of value, Rousseau's critique of inequality, and the broader project of grounding political authority in reason rather than revelation—provided the immediate intellectual toolkit Marx deployed and radicalized.

Fifth, the French Revolution and its aftermath established both the revolutionary tradition Marx adopted and the class consciousness that made his analysis feel empirically grounded rather than merely theoretical.

Together, these threads explain not merely where Marx got his ideas but why his synthesis worked—why it carried intellectual credibility, emotional force, moral weight, and the sense of scientific inevitability that made Marxism one of the most powerful ideologies in human history.

II. THE GREEK FOUNDATIONS: MATERIALISM AND DIALECTICS

A. Democritus and the Birth of Materialism

The claim that the universe can be explained through matter and natural processes rather than divine intervention—the foundational assumption of materialist philosophy—was not Marx's innovation. It was articulated by Greek philosophers in the sixth and fifth centuries BCE, more than two thousand years before Marx was born.

The pre-Socratic philosophers of early Greece sought natural explanations for the phenomena they observed. Rather than accepting that thunder occurred because Zeus was angry, they asked what natural processes could account for it. This was revolutionary in its context—a systematic turn away from mythological explanation toward rational investigation of the physical world.

Among these early investigators, Democritus of Abdera (approximately 460-370 BCE) proposed the most radical and consequential theory. Reality, he argued, consisted entirely of atoms—indivisible particles—moving through empty void. Everything that existed, from stars to human beings to thoughts, was composed of these fundamental particles in various

configurations. The gods, if they existed at all, played no role in governing the natural world. The universe operated according to mechanical necessity, not divine will.

This was not merely a theory about physics. It was a philosophical stance about the nature of reality itself—what philosophers call an ontology. Democritus proposed that the supernatural was unnecessary as an explanation for anything. Nature was self-sufficient. The universe was material all the way down.

Epicurus of Samos (341-270 BCE) developed Democritus's atomism into a comprehensive philosophical system. Epicurus retained the atomic theory but added crucial elaborations: atoms could swerve from their predetermined paths (introducing a kind of indeterminacy into the material world), and the gods, though they might exist, were entirely disengaged from human affairs and exercised no providential care over the universe. Human life should be lived according to pleasure and the avoidance of pain, not in fear of divine punishment.

The Roman poet Lucretius (99-55 BCE) transmitted this Epicurean materialism to the Latin-speaking world in his magnificent poem De Rerum Natura, which provided one of the most complete and eloquent expressions of materialist philosophy to survive from the ancient world. Through Lucretius, materialist thinking became part of the Roman intellectual inheritance.

The significance of this tradition for Marx is direct and documented. Marx chose to write his doctoral dissertation (completed in 1841) on precisely this subject: the difference between Democritean and Epicurean natural philosophy. He spent years studying these ancient materialists, absorbing their fundamental claim that reality could be explained without recourse to supernatural forces. When Marx later developed his own materialist philosophy—the doctrine that material conditions of production determine human consciousness rather than the reverse—he was building on a tradition that Greek philosophers had established twenty-three centuries earlier. He did not invent materialism. He inherited it, studied it explicitly, and extended it into the domain of history and economics.

B. Heraclitus and Dialectical Thinking

If materialism provided one pillar of Marx's philosophy, dialectical thinking provided the other. The idea that reality is characterized by constant change, by the tension and conflict of opposites, and by the transformation of one state into another through the resolution of contradictions—this was also a Greek contribution, and one of the oldest in Western philosophy.

Heraclitus of Ephesus (approximately 535-475 BCE) articulated what would become the foundation of dialectical thought. His famous declaration that one cannot step into the same river twice expressed a deeper insight: that reality is fundamentally a process of change rather than a collection of fixed objects. The river appears to be the same river, but the water is constantly flowing, constantly being replaced. What appears stable is actually a dynamic equilibrium maintained by opposing forces.

Heraclitus went further. He argued that change was not merely a feature of the world but its fundamental nature, governed by a principle he called the logos—a rational order underlying the apparent chaos of events. The logos operated through the tension of opposites: hot and cold, wet and dry, day and night. These opposites were not simply different but were aspects of a single unified process. War and peace, creation and destruction, were not separate phenomena but moments in an ongoing cycle.

This insight—that the universe moves through stages of conflict and resolution, that opposing forces generate transformation, that apparent opposites are actually related aspects of a deeper unity—is the core of what would later be called dialectical thinking. Hegel systematized it in the early nineteenth century into the thesis-antithesis-synthesis framework that became the standard vocabulary of German idealist philosophy. Marx then took Hegel's dialectical method and, as he put it, set it on its material feet: where Hegel had argued that the dialectic operated through the development of Idea or Spirit, Marx argued that it operated through the material conditions of economic production and class conflict.

But the underlying logic—the idea that history moves through stages of conflict, that contradictions between opposing social forces generate transformation, that each stage contains the seeds of its successor—was already part of the Western intellectual tradition when Marx encountered it. He did not invent dialectical thinking any more than he invented materialism. He inherited both from the Greeks and combined them into dialectical materialism.

C. Stoic Cosmopolitanism and Marx's Internationalism

A third thread running from ancient Greece into Marx's thought concerns the scope of moral and political obligation. The Stoic philosophers, who flourished from the third century BCE onward, developed the concept of cosmopolitanism—the idea that all human beings shared membership in a single rational community that transcended the boundaries of any particular city, kingdom, or empire.

When Diogenes the Cynic was asked where he was from, he reportedly replied: 'I am a citizen of the world.' The Stoics formalized this intuition into a philosophical system. Because all human beings shared in universal reason, they argued, the moral obligations that bound one citizen to another within a particular political community actually extended to all of humanity. Natural law—the principles of justice discoverable through reason—applied universally, not merely to the citizens of one state.

This cosmopolitan tradition influenced Marx's insistence on internationalism—the conviction that the working class's interests were not bound by national boundaries but were shared across all industrialized societies. The famous declaration in the Communist Manifesto that 'the workers have no country' was not Marx's original insight but an extension of a philosophical tradition that the Stoics had established more than two thousand years earlier. The idea that moral and political solidarity could transcend the boundaries of particular communities was already part of the Western intellectual inheritance.

III. THE ROMAN PRECEDENT: CLASS STRUGGLE AND SECULAR LAW

A. The Conflict of the Orders: Two Centuries of Institutionalized Class Struggle

When Marx declared in the Communist Manifesto that 'the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles,' he was not proposing a revolutionary new framework for understanding political change. He was articulating a principle that had already been demonstrated through two centuries of actual political conflict in ancient Rome.

The early Roman Republic (509-287 BCE) was divided between two distinct social classes: patricians and plebeians. Patricians were the aristocratic families who claimed descent from Rome's original ruling elite. They monopolized the magistracies, the priesthoods, the Senate seats, and control over the land and wealth of the city. They constituted approximately ten percent of the population. Plebeians—farmers, artisans, merchants, soldiers—constituted the other ninety percent. They were excluded from political office, forbidden from intermarrying with patricians, and subject to legal systems they could not access or understand, because the law was unwritten and controlled by patrician priests.

Beginning in 494 BCE, the plebeians mounted a sustained campaign to redress this imbalance that would continue for over two hundred years. The methods were institutional rather than violent: withdrawal of labor (the plebeians seceded from Rome and refused military service, creating a crisis the patricians could not ignore), demands for written law (producing the Twelve Tables in 450 BCE, which made Roman law public and knowable for the first time), and the creation of new political offices specifically designed to protect plebeian interests, most notably the Tribune of the Plebs.

The Tribune was a remarkable innovation. Elected by the plebeians alone, tribunes possessed the power of intercessio—the ability to veto any magistrate's action, any Senate decree, even a consul's order. Their persons were declared sacrosanct; killing a tribune was punishable by death and the confiscation of the killer's property. This office institutionalized class struggle itself, giving the lower orders a permanent, legally protected mechanism for challenging patrician dominance.

The conflict continued through a series of legislative victories: the Licinian-Sextian Laws of 367 BCE, which required that at least one of the two consuls (Rome's highest magistrates) be plebeian; and the Lex Hortensia of 287 BCE, which made laws passed by the plebeian assembly binding on all citizens. By the end of this struggle, the patrician-plebeian distinction had largely been replaced by a new division between the wealthy—patrician and plebeian alike—and the poor.

What matters for understanding Marx is not the specific outcome of this conflict but the pattern it established. Rome demonstrated over two centuries that societies could be understood as

arenas of structured conflict between social classes with fundamentally different material interests, that these conflicts could be institutionalized and managed through political mechanisms, and that the balance of power between classes could shift through sustained collective action. This was not theory. It was lived experience, documented extensively by Roman historians and analyzed by Roman political thinkers, available for any later thinker to study and draw upon.

B. Roman Law: The Secular Legal Framework

Roman law represented the most sophisticated development of secular, reason-based legal thinking in the ancient world, and it became one of the foundational intellectual inheritances of Western civilization. Its significance for the path to Marx lies not in any specific legal principle but in the broader project it represented: the idea that human societies could be organized according to rational legal codes developed through deliberation and precedent rather than divine commandment or aristocratic custom.

The Romans distinguished between several categories of law that would prove enormously influential for later Western thought. Jus civile was the specific law of Roman citizens, derived from statutes and legal tradition. Jus gentium was a broader body of law applicable to all peoples, based on common principles that Roman jurists observed across different cultures—principles governing contracts, property, and commerce that seemed to arise from the nature of rational social interaction itself. And jus naturale was the most ambitious category: law discoverable through reason, universal in scope, and higher in authority than any human-made statute.

Roman law developed through a distinctive process. Jurists—legal scholars who were not judges but advisors—developed legal principles through careful case-by-case reasoning, building doctrines through the interpretation and extension of existing rules. This casuistic method produced a body of legal thought that was systematic, internally consistent, and grounded in rational principles rather than sacred texts or arbitrary authority. The Romans codified their law, producing written legal codes that could be studied, taught, and applied consistently across a vast empire.

The enduring concepts that Roman law contributed to Western legal and political thought are numerous: the distinction between public and private spheres, individual property rights, contractual obligations, procedures for resolving disputes, the presumption that legal actors are rational agents making calculated decisions. These were not merely legal technicalities but philosophical commitments about the nature of human social organization—a vision of society as a collection of rational individuals whose interactions could be governed by predictable, transparent rules.

Marx's relationship to this tradition was complex. He did not simply build upon Roman law's secular framework; he inverted its central claim. Where Roman natural law theorists argued that law represented universal rational principles accessible to all, Marx argued that law was a tool of class domination—that the legal systems ruling societies served the material interests of

whoever held economic power. This inversion was itself built upon the Roman tradition: Marx understood the tradition well enough to challenge it on its own terms.

C. Cicero and the Natural Law Legacy

Marcus Tullius Cicero (106-43 BCE), Rome's greatest orator and one of its most influential political thinkers, provided the most complete articulation of natural law theory in the ancient world. In his work De Legibus (On the Laws), Cicero synthesized Greek Stoic philosophy with Roman legal tradition to produce a theory of universal law that would influence Western thought for two millennia.

Cicero's central claim was that true law was not merely human convention but a reflection of rational principles inherent in nature itself. 'True law is right reason in agreement with nature,' he wrote. 'It is of universal application, unchanging and everlasting; it calls and invites men to duty by its commandments, and forbids men from wrongdoing by its threats.' This law was not enacted by any particular legislature or sovereign. It was discovered by reason and was binding on all rational beings regardless of where they lived or what particular legal codes governed their communities.

This concept of natural law—universal, rational, discoverable through reason, and superior to any particular human-made statute—became one of the most consequential ideas in Western intellectual history. It was absorbed into medieval Christian thought by Thomas Aquinas, who argued that natural law was God's law as perceived through human reason. It was secularized by Hugo Grotius in the seventeenth century, who argued that natural law would be valid even if God did not exist. And it was deployed by Enlightenment thinkers—Locke, Rousseau, Jefferson—as the foundation for natural rights theory and the justification of constitutional government.

Marx inherited this entire tradition and then challenged it. His critique of 'bourgeois rights'—his argument that the rights proclaimed in declarations of liberty and equality were formal abstractions that concealed real material exploitation—was directed precisely at the natural law tradition that Cicero had begun and Locke had extended. To understand why Marx's critique was so powerful, one must understand what he was critiquing: a two-thousand-year-old intellectual tradition that had become the dominant framework for Western political thought.

IV. THE JERUSALEM THREAD: THE NARRATIVE STRUCTURE MARX BORROWED

The Eschatological Framework: The Single Most Important Thread

If there is one element of Marx's intellectual genealogy that is most often overlooked and most consequential for understanding why Marxism carried the psychological force it did, it is the narrative structure Marx borrowed from Judeo-Christian eschatology. This is not merely an

interesting parallel or a surface-level resemblance. It is the deep architecture of Marxist thought—the story within the story that gives Marxism its sense of meaning, its certainty, its moral urgency, and its capacity to inspire the kind of total commitment that sustained revolutionary movements across generations.

To see this clearly, one must first understand what eschatology is and why it mattered so profoundly in Western civilization.

A. The Hebrew Prophetic Tradition

The Hebrew prophets of the eighth through sixth centuries BCE developed a tradition of moral critique that would become one of the most enduring features of Western civilization. Amos, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel—these prophets confronted the ruling classes of ancient Israel and Judah with searing indictments of economic exploitation and social injustice.

Amos declared that God hated the festivals of the wealthy when they were accompanied by the oppression of the poor. Isaiah demanded justice for the oppressed, fair treatment of widows and orphans and strangers. The prophetic tradition held that ritual observance without social righteousness was worthless—that any system that produced abundance for the few while impoverishing the many was, by definition, morally corrupt regardless of how faithfully it observed religious forms.

This critique was revolutionary not merely in its content but in its structure. The prophets did not simply observe that injustice existed. They proclaimed that injustice was temporary—that God would intervene to restore justice, that the suffering of the oppressed had meaning within a larger narrative arc that moved toward redemption. Israel had once lived in covenant harmony with God. That harmony had been broken—through disobedience, through the corruption of the wealthy, through the abandonment of justice. Suffering followed. But the prophets promised that God would send a messiah who would restore the covenant, overthrow the wicked, and establish a kingdom of justice and abundance.

This was eschatology: a narrative about the end of history, or rather about history's ultimate destination. It was not merely prediction but moral framework. It told believers that their suffering was not random or meaningless but part of a purposeful movement toward justice. It told them that those who oppressed them were on the wrong side of history. And it told them that salvation was not merely possible but certain—ordained by the same God who had created the world.

B. Christian Eschatology: The Narrative Engine

Early Christianity inherited the Hebrew prophetic tradition and intensified its eschatological character. The New Testament proclaimed that Jesus of Nazareth was the messiah the prophets had foretold—the savior who would redeem humanity from sin and suffering. The crucifixion was not a defeat but a sacrifice: Christ's suffering atoned for humanity's sins and opened the path to salvation. The resurrection confirmed that death was not the final word. And the Second Coming—Christ's return in glory—was promised as the apocalyptic moment when

the old order would be destroyed, the dead would be raised, judgment would be pronounced, and the Kingdom of God would be established on earth.

The narrative structure of Christian salvation history was precise and deeply internalized by Western societies over two thousand years of cultural transmission. It moved through five stages that would prove remarkably durable as a template for understanding historical change.

First, there was primitive innocence: the Garden of Eden, in which humanity lived in harmony with God, free from sin, suffering, and death. This was the original state—the condition from which all subsequent history departed.

Second, there was the Fall: the moment when humanity sinned and was expelled from Eden, introducing death, suffering, and moral corruption into the world. The Fall was not merely a biographical event in Adam and Eve's lives but a civilizational rupture, the beginning of a fallen condition that pervaded all of human existence.

Third, there was suffering: the long period of exile and oppression that followed the Fall. Humanity lived under the dominion of sin, experiencing alienation from God, from one another, and from the world. The prophets' cries of injustice, the psalmists' laments, the exile in Babylon—all were expressions of this fallen condition.

Fourth, there was messianic deliverance: Christ's arrival, his teaching, his death, and his resurrection. The messiah did not merely improve the human condition. He redeemed it, offering a path back to the wholeness that the Fall had destroyed.

Fifth, there was the Kingdom of God: the final state toward which all of history was moving. The Second Coming would inaugurate this kingdom—a state of perfect justice, abundance, and communion that would restore what Eden had been and fulfill what the prophets had promised.

This narrative was not merely theology. It was psychology—a deeply internalized framework for understanding what it meant to be human, what was wrong with the present world, and what the future held. Two thousand years of Christian preaching, art, literature, and ritual transmission had embedded this story structure in the consciousness of Western societies at the deepest possible level. Any ideology that activated this narrative architecture—even while replacing its supernatural content with secular equivalents—would carry an emotional and psychological force that purely rational arguments could not match.

C. The Secularization: How Marx Took the Structure Without the Supernatural

Marx's genius—and it was genuine genius, whatever one thinks of its consequences—lay in recognizing that this narrative structure could be detached from its supernatural content while retaining its psychological power. He did not merely parallel the Christian narrative in passing. He reproduced its exact architecture, substituting secular concepts at every point while preserving the story's emotional logic.

Primitive innocence became primitive communism. Marx argued that the earliest human societies had been essentially egalitarian—that before the emergence of private property, human beings had lived communally, sharing resources without class division. This was not Eden, but it served the same narrative function: a state of original wholeness from which humanity had fallen.

The Fall became the emergence of private property. Marx argued that the first person who enclosed a piece of land and declared 'this is mine'—and found others willing to accept that claim—had initiated the process of class division that would define all subsequent history. This was not sin, but it served the same narrative function: a civilizational rupture that introduced exploitation, alienation, and suffering into human existence. Notably, Marx was here drawing directly on Rousseau, who had made almost exactly this argument in his Discourse on Inequality seventy years earlier.

Suffering became capitalism. Marx depicted the condition of workers under industrial capitalism with the same moral urgency that the prophets had brought to the condition of the oppressed under ancient monarchies. Workers were alienated from the products of their labor, from the process of production, from their own human nature, and from one another. They lived under a system that extracted the value they created while paying them only enough to survive. This was not exile from God, but it served the same narrative function: a condition of bondage and suffering that demanded redemption.

The messiah became the proletariat. Marx argued that the working class was the 'universal class'—the class whose liberation would liberate all humanity, just as Christ's sacrifice had been understood as redemptive for the entire human race. The proletariat did not save humanity through supernatural power but through revolutionary action. Yet the narrative function was identical: a chosen agent, identified not by individual virtue but by social position, whose suffering was itself the precondition for universal salvation.

The Kingdom of God became communism. Marx's vision of a classless, stateless, non-exploitative society in which human beings could fully develop their creative capacities was not paradise, but it served the same narrative function: a final state of wholeness, abundance, and freedom that represented the culmination of historical development and the restoration of what had been lost.

Most crucially, Marx preserved the eschatological character of the narrative—its insistence that this progression was not merely possible but inevitable. Just as Christian eschatology taught that the Second Coming was certain because God had ordained it, Marxist historical materialism taught that communist revolution was certain because the laws of history demanded it. The certainty was grounded in different authorities—God's will versus the contradictions of capitalism—but the psychological effect was the same: followers knew they were on the right side of history, that their suffering had meaning, and that victory was guaranteed.

This is why Marxism carried a force that purely economic or political theories could not match. It was not merely an analysis of how societies worked. It was a salvation narrative—a story about

where humanity had come from, what was wrong with the present, and where it was going. And that story had been rehearsed, in its religious form, for two thousand years before Marx was born.

V. THE BRIDGE: CONSTANTINE, THE MIDDLE AGES, AND THE REFORMATION

The threads traced so far—Greek materialism and dialectics, Roman class struggle and secular law, Judeo-Christian eschatology—did not remain in continuous active development through the medieval period. Understanding why requires a brief account of how the dual infrastructure of Western civilization functioned between the fourth and sixteenth centuries.

Constantine (313 CE) fused Christianity with the Greco-Roman tradition, creating two coexisting paths in Western civilization—a religious path (the Church, divine law, salvation theology) and a secular path (Roman law, Greek philosophy, the republican tradition). During the medieval period (500-1500), the religious path dominated while the secular path persisted in a dormant state, preserved primarily in the universities where classical texts were studied and taught. The Athens tradition did not disappear. It simply waited.

The Protestant Reformation (1517-1648) shattered the religious monopoly. When Luther challenged Catholic authority and no single Christianity could claim universal legitimacy, thinkers began turning back to the secular path as an alternative source of intellectual authority. This is why the Enlightenment was possible—not as invention, but as a resurrection of traditions that had never actually disappeared. The Greek philosophical inheritance, the Roman legal tradition, the republican political tradition—all had been preserved through centuries of university teaching and scholarly transmission. The Reformation simply created the conditions in which they could once again compete with religious authority as the foundation of knowledge and political legitimacy.

VI. THE ENLIGHTENMENT TOOLKIT: LOCKE, ROUSSEAU, AND THE INTELLECTUAL RAW MATERIALS

The Context: Why the Secular Path Resurged

The Enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was not a single intellectual movement but a sustained project of deploying the Athens path—secular reason, natural law, rational investigation—against the Jerusalem path's claims to ultimate authority. This project was driven partly by intellectual conviction and partly by material interest: a rising commercial and professional class found the Athens tradition useful for challenging monarchical and clerical power that constrained their economic and political ambitions.

Merchants wanted predictable legal systems based on rational rules rather than aristocratic privilege. Professionals wanted positions based on merit rather than birth. All of them wanted the intellectual resources to challenge divine-right monarchy on grounds that did not themselves depend on religious authority. The Greek and Roman inheritance provided exactly these resources.

The scientific revolution of the seventeenth century provided confidence that the project was viable. Newton's demonstration that the universe operated according to discoverable mathematical laws showed that human reason could penetrate the structure of nature. If nature was rational and law-governed, the Enlightenment thinkers reasoned, perhaps human society was as well—and could be reorganized according to principles discovered through the same rational investigation.

A. Locke's Labor Theory: The Seed Marx Radicalized

John Locke's Second Treatise of Government (1689) contained an argument about property that would become one of the most consequential claims in Western political philosophy—and would ultimately provide Marx with one of his most important intellectual raw materials.

Locke argued that property originated in labor. When a person mixed their labor with nature—picking an apple from a tree, tilling unclaimed land, building a shelter—they thereby acquired a legitimate claim to the result. This was not mere convention or legal fiction but a natural right, grounded in the self-evident principle that every person owned their own body and therefore owned the product of their body's labor.

Locke's purpose in making this argument was to justify private property against critics who argued that God had given the earth to all of humanity in common. If labor created property, then the farmer who cultivated land had a rightful claim to it that the idle had not. Property was not theft—it was the legitimate reward of effort.

Marx took Locke's argument and radicalized it. If labor truly created all value—if the only source of economic worth was human productive activity—then what was the source of capitalists' profits? Capitalists did not labor; they owned. If labor alone created value and capitalists owned the means of production but did not work them, then the surplus value that accumulated as profit represented labor that workers had performed but for which they had not been paid. Locke's labor theory of value, intended to justify property, became in Marx's hands the foundation for the most devastating critique of property ever articulated.

The intellectual lineage was explicit. Adam Smith had proposed the labor theory of value in The Wealth of Nations (1776), arguing that the price of commodities was determined by the amount of labor required to produce them. David Ricardo had refined it further in his Principles of Political Economy (1817), developing a sophisticated analysis of how rent, profit, and wages were distributed. Marx studied both economists in detail, acknowledging their contributions while pushing their logic to conclusions they had not drawn. He did not invent the labor theory of

value. He found it in the British political economy tradition—already one of the most prestigious intellectual traditions in Europe—and extended it to its most radical implications.

B. Rousseau's Critique of Inequality

Jean-Jacques Rousseau's Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men (1755) anticipated many of Marx's central arguments with striking precision. Rousseau argued that human beings were naturally good—solitary, peaceful, self-sufficient creatures who became competitive, selfish, and cruel only through the corrupting influence of society.

The mechanism of corruption was private property. Rousseau identified the emergence of property as the foundational moment in the creation of inequality. 'The first man who, having enclosed a piece of ground,' he wrote, 'bethought himself of saying This is mine, and found people simple enough to believe him, was the real founder of civil society.' Everything that followed—inequality, slavery, the state itself—was the consequence of this initial act of enclosure.

Marx's account of how private property emerged and generated class division was not substantially different from Rousseau's. The Fall from primitive communism into class society, the argument that inequality was not natural but historically produced, the insistence that legal and political institutions served to legitimize economic domination rather than to promote justice—all of these were already present in Rousseau's work, formulated with extraordinary clarity and moral force, seventy years before the Communist Manifesto.

What Marx added was not the critique itself but a systematic economic analysis of how exploitation actually worked in industrial capitalism, and an argument about why the critique had implications for revolutionary action rather than merely reform.

C. Rousseau's General Will: From Civic Virtue to Universal Class

Rousseau's Social Contract (1762) contained another concept that Marx would later transform: the general will. Rousseau argued that legitimate government was not merely the expression of majority opinion but the embodiment of the common good—what was truly best for the community, regardless of what particular individuals might say they wanted. Citizens who pursued their private interests at the expense of the common good were not exercising their freedom but betraying it.

The concept was ominous in its implications. Rousseau wrote that citizens who refused to obey the general will would be 'constrained to do so by the entire body'—'which means only that he will be forced to be free.' This apparent paradox—that coercion could constitute liberation—would have profound consequences when the French Revolution's Jacobins deployed it as justification for revolutionary terror. And Marx would later transform it again: where Rousseau had located the general will in the civic community, Marx located it in the proletariat. The working class, as the 'universal class,' was the social group whose liberation corresponded to the liberation of all humanity. The general will was not the will of the majority

but the will of history—expressed through the class whose material interests aligned with the rational development of society.

This intellectual lineage—from Rousseau through Robespierre to Marx—was not a series of independent inventions but a continuous conversation within the Athens path's tradition of secular political philosophy, each thinker building on what the previous generation had established.

D. The Authority of Reason

Underlying all of the Enlightenment's specific arguments was a broader epistemological claim: that human reason could discover truths about the natural and social world that were valid independent of any religious authority. Newton had demonstrated this for the physical universe. The Enlightenment philosophers proposed to extend it to the human world—to politics, economics, morality, and social organization.

This claim was enormously consequential for Marx's project. It meant that an argument grounded in reason and empirical evidence carried a kind of authority that religious or traditional claims could not match in educated Western circles. When Marx presented his theory of history and economics as 'scientific'—as a discovery of the laws governing social development, analogous to Newton's discovery of the laws governing planetary motion—he was deploying the authority that the scientific revolution had established. His theory was credible because it claimed to be reason-based rather than faith-based. And that claim drew on a tradition of intellectual authority that the Enlightenment had spent two centuries building.

VII. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION: VIOLENCE, CLASS, AND THE RADICAL MODEL

A. Two Revolutionary Models

The revolutionary era of 1776-1848 provided Marx with the most immediate intellectual and experiential raw materials for his synthesis. Two revolutionary models competed during this period, and Marx's choice between them was consequential for everything that followed.

The American Revolution of 1776 represented what might be called moderate Enlightenment deployed as political action. Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence drew almost directly from Locke's Second Treatise—natural rights, consent of the governed, the right to alter or abolish tyrannical government. The Constitution of 1787 implemented Montesquieu's separation of powers and Madison's checks and balances. The revolution was relatively contained, property rights were respected, and the new government operated as a constitutional republic with procedural safeguards against the concentration of power.

The French Revolution of 1789 began similarly—the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen proclaimed Lockean natural rights, and the Constitution of 1791 established a

constitutional monarchy. But the revolution radicalized under pressure from war, economic crisis, and the mobilization of urban workers (the sans-culottes), and by 1793 the Jacobins had seized power and begun implementing a totalitarian program of social transformation that bore no resemblance to the American model.

Marx studied both revolutions carefully and chose the French model. The American Revolution had demonstrated that Enlightenment principles could be implemented politically, but it had not challenged the fundamental structure of property ownership or class division. The French Revolution—particularly its Jacobin phase—had demonstrated something far more consequential for Marx's purposes: that revolutionary action could transform the social order itself, that class consciousness could emerge under pressure, that the relationship between bourgeoisie and working people was fundamentally antagonistic rather than merely competitive.

B. The Jacobin Precedent

The Jacobins' revolutionary terror of 1793-1794 established several precedents that would directly inform Marx's understanding of what revolutionary transformation required. The Committee of Public Safety concentrated executive power in a small group of ideologically committed leaders who ruled by decree, claiming to embody the general will of the people. Revolutionary tribunals judged not whether individuals had committed specific crimes but whether they harbored counter-revolutionary sentiments—treating political opposition as a category requiring elimination rather than a perspective requiring debate.

Robespierre's famous declaration that 'terror is nothing other than justice, prompt, severe, inflexible; it is therefore an emanation of virtue' formalized the Jacobin argument that violence in service of rational social transformation was not merely permissible but morally required. The Jacobins also attempted to remake all aspects of French life according to rational principles—a new calendar, new weights and measures, new forms of worship, new clothing. This totalizing ambition—the belief that enlightened authority could and should remake human society completely—carried implications that would resonate through Marx's thought and beyond.

Marx praised the Jacobins explicitly. He saw in their revolution not a cautionary tale but a demonstration of what was possible when revolutionary consciousness achieved political power. The French model showed that the bourgeoisie could be challenged, that property could be redistributed, that the social order could be transformed through collective action. These lessons were available to Marx because the French Revolution had happened—because the Jacobins had tested these methods at scale and documented the results.

C. Marx Chooses the French Model

The reason Marx favored the French revolutionary tradition over the American was not arbitrary. The American Revolution had been fought by a colonial elite against a distant imperial power—a conflict that left the fundamental structures of property and class essentially intact. The French Revolution, by contrast, had become a conflict within European society between

classes with opposing material interests. It had produced class consciousness: an awareness, among both bourgeoisie and workers, that their interests were fundamentally irreconcilable.

This was the insight Marx needed. If the conflict between property owners and workers was merely a misunderstanding that could be resolved through better institutions—as the American constitutional tradition suggested—then Marx's entire theory of historical materialism would be unnecessary. But if the conflict was structural, rooted in the nature of capitalist production itself, then reform was inadequate and revolution was the only path forward. The French Revolution, and particularly its radicalization, provided the empirical evidence for this conclusion.

D. 1848 and the June Days: Class War Made Explicit

The revolutions of 1848 across Europe provided Marx with the most direct and personal confirmation of his analysis. Marx watched these revolutions in real time—first in Brussels, then in Paris, then in Cologne—and documented what he saw in a series of articles that would become the basis for The Class Struggles in France.

The critical moment was the June Days of 1848 in Paris. The Republican government, facing a budget crisis, voted to close the National Workshops—state-run employment projects that had been absorbing tens of thousands of unemployed workers. The workers rose in rebellion. Between forty thousand and fifty thousand insurgents erected barricades across Paris. General Cavaignac, granted dictatorial powers by the National Assembly, crushed the uprising with overwhelming force: approximately three thousand workers were killed, fifteen thousand arrested and many deported.

This was not a conflict between the people and a tyrant, as the revolutionary rhetoric of 1789 had framed it. It was a conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat—between property owners and workers—and the bourgeoisie had used state violence to defend its interests against the working class. Marx analyzed the June Days with surgical precision and drew the conclusion that would become central to his theory: peaceful reform was impossible. The ruling class would never voluntarily surrender its privileges. Revolution was not a regrettable last resort but a historical necessity, because the material interests of the classes were fundamentally irreconcilable.

The June Days did not give Marx his theory. They confirmed a theory he had already been developing. But they transformed it from philosophical argument into empirical observation—from what Marx believed must be true into what he had witnessed happening.

VIII. THE SYNTHESIS: HOW MARX PULLED THE THREADS TOGETHER

A. The Communist Manifesto (1848): The Argument Assembled

The Communist Manifesto, published in February 1848—days before the French Revolution of that year erupted—represents the moment when Marx's synthesis became publicly visible. In thirty-one pages, Marx and Engels assembled the threads traced in this paper into a single, comprehensive argument.

The opening declaration—'A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of communism'—established the eschatological tone immediately. Something was coming, something that existing powers could not ignore or prevent. The manifesto then proceeded to lay out the argument in its essential structure.

'The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.' This was not a new observation. It had been demonstrated in Rome, articulated by Rousseau, and illustrated by the French Revolution. But Marx gave it the force of a universal law—not merely something that had happened in particular cases but the fundamental mechanism driving all historical change.

The manifesto traced the history of class conflict through stages—feudal lord versus serf, master versus apprentice, and now bourgeoisie versus proletariat—arguing that each stage contained the contradictions that would eventually generate the next. This dialectical progression was borrowed from Hegel, who had borrowed the dialectical method from Heraclitus. The materialist content—the insistence that economic relations rather than ideas drove historical change—was Marx's own contribution, but it was built on the Greek philosophical tradition of materialism that Democritus had established and Marx had studied in his doctoral dissertation.

The manifesto's account of capitalism—how it concentrated wealth, how it created the proletariat through the dispossession of previous classes, how its internal contradictions would eventually make it unsustainable—drew on the British political economy that Smith and Ricardo had developed. The moral urgency of the argument—the insistence that the proletariat's suffering was unjust and demanded redress—drew on the prophetic tradition that had been running through Western civilization since Amos.

And the culmination—the prophecy that the proletariat would rise, overthrow the bourgeoisie, and establish a classless society—reproduced the eschatological structure of Christian salvation history in secular form. Fall, suffering, messianic agent, revolutionary transformation, and the Kingdom. The story was ancient. The vocabulary was new.

B. Das Kapital (1867): The Scientific Apparatus

Capital, published nearly two decades after the Manifesto, provided the comprehensive economic analysis that Marx believed was necessary to demonstrate his theory's scientific validity. Where the Manifesto had been a political proclamation, Capital was an attempt at rigorous political economy—a work of over a thousand pages analyzing the mechanisms by which capitalism extracted wealth from workers.

The centerpiece of Capital was Marx's theory of surplus value—his account of how exploitation actually worked at the level of individual transactions. Marx built this theory on the labor theory of value that Smith and Ricardo had already established as orthodoxy in British political economy. If the value of commodities was determined by the socially necessary labor time required to produce them, then the question of where profit came from became pressing: if workers produced all the value through their labor, why did capitalists receive a share?

Marx's answer was precise and devastating. Workers did not sell their labor—they sold their labor-power, their capacity to work for a given period. The value of labor-power was determined by the cost of reproducing it: the food, shelter, and other necessities required to keep a worker alive and able to work. But the value that the worker actually produced during a working day exceeded the value of their labor-power. The difference—surplus value—was appropriated by the capitalist. Profit was not a reward for entrepreneurship or risk-taking. It was unpaid labor.

This argument was built on Ricardo's framework but pushed to a conclusion Ricardo had not drawn. Ricardo had recognized the labor theory of value but had not followed its implications to a critique of profit as exploitation. Marx did. The intellectual genealogy was direct: Locke proposed the labor theory, Smith systematized it, Ricardo refined it, and Marx radicalized it.

Capital also developed Marx's account of capitalism's contradictions—the tendency of the rate of profit to fall, the periodic crises of overproduction, the concentration of capital in fewer and fewer hands, the growing immiseration of the working class. These were not predictions Marx invented from thin air. They were analyses of patterns he observed in the empirical data of industrial capitalism, interpreted through a theoretical framework he had assembled from existing intellectual traditions.

C. Why the Synthesis Worked

Marx's synthesis succeeded where other contemporary socialist theories failed for several interconnected reasons, all of which trace back to the genealogy this paper has traced.

First, Marx built upon proven intellectual traditions rather than inventing new ones. Hegelian dialectics was already the dominant framework in German philosophy—one of the most prestigious intellectual traditions in Europe. British political economy, with its labor theory of value, was orthodox academic economics. French revolutionary tradition had demonstrated that social transformation through collective action was actually possible. Christian eschatology had been internalized by Western societies over two millennia. By drawing on all of these established traditions, Marx gave his synthesis an intellectual credibility that utopian socialists who invented their own frameworks from scratch could not match.

Second, Marx's theory aligned with observable material conditions. The industrial revolution had created a visible and growing class of dispossessed workers whose misery was empirically documented—by Engels in Manchester, by government statistics, by the experience of millions. Capitalism's periodic crises of overproduction (1837, 1847, 1857, 1873) validated Marx's predictions about capitalism's instability. The failure of the 1848 revolutions confirmed his

argument that peaceful reform was impossible. Material conditions made Marx's theory plausible in a way that no amount of intellectual brilliance alone could have achieved.

Third, and most fundamentally, Marx's synthesis combined the intellectual authority of scientific reasoning with the emotional architecture of a salvation narrative. It appeared to be purely secular, purely rational, purely empirical. But it carried the psychological weight of a story that Western societies had been telling themselves for two thousand years—a story about original innocence, fall, suffering, redemption, and paradise restored. This combination—reason's credibility with faith's passion—was unprecedented in the history of Western thought. No other ideology had managed to fuse them so completely.

D. The Genealogy Complete

Marx himself acknowledged some of his intellectual debts while obscuring others. He cited Hegel, Ricardo, and Smith explicitly. He engaged with Rousseau and the French revolutionary tradition in his political writings. But he rarely acknowledged the eschatological structure his theory reproduced, partly because doing so would have undermined his claim that Marxism was scientific rather than quasi-religious, and partly because the borrowing was structural rather than verbal—Marx did not copy Christian theology's words but reproduced its narrative logic.

Nevertheless, every major element of Marxist theory had already existed within Western civilization before Marx assembled them. Materialism had been part of the Athens path since Democritus. Dialectical thinking had been part of it since Heraclitus. Class struggle had been institutionalized in Rome for two centuries. The labor theory of value had been proposed by Locke and systematized by Ricardo. The critique of inequality had been articulated by Rousseau. The revolutionary tradition had been established by the French Revolution. And the eschatological narrative structure—the story that gave Marxism its psychological power—had been part of the Jerusalem path since the Hebrew prophets first proclaimed that suffering could have meaning and that redemption was possible.

Marx was not the inventor of Marxism. He was its synthesizer—the mind that recognized how threads already present in Western civilization could be woven together into something that felt genuinely new while being built entirely from what was already there.

IX. CONCLUSION: THE GENEALOGY AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

The genealogy traced in this paper has a simple but consequential implication: Marxism was not an alien ideology imposed on Western civilization from outside. It was a development within Western civilization, drawing on both of the dual infrastructure's fundamental traditions—the Athens path of secular reason and the Jerusalem path of religious narrative. Understanding this matters for several reasons.

First, it explains Marxism's extraordinary power. An ideology that combines the intellectual authority of the Enlightenment's scientific tradition with the emotional architecture of the Western world's most enduring salvation narrative is not merely persuasive. It is compelling in a way that purely rational arguments cannot match. Marx's genius was not in inventing new ideas but in recognizing that existing ideas could be combined in a way that no one had previously attempted—that materialism, dialectics, class analysis, labor theory, and eschatological narrative could be woven into a single, internally consistent system. The result carried the force of science and the weight of prophecy simultaneously.

Second, it reveals the mechanism by which major ideologies emerge in Western civilization. Neither the Athens path nor the Jerusalem path was eliminated by the other; both persisted as available resources within the culture. When a thinker recognized that elements from both paths could be synthesized into a new framework—as Constantine had earlier synthesized Christianity with Greco-Roman civilization—the result was not merely a new idea but a new civilizational possibility. Marx's synthesis was of this order: not an invention but a recombination of pre-existing elements into something unprecedented.

Third, it demonstrates a pattern of intellectual development that operates across centuries rather than years. The threads that became Marxism were not assembled in a single generation. Materialism had been developing since the sixth century BCE. Dialectical thinking had been developing since the same period. Roman class analysis had been accumulating institutional knowledge for two centuries before the first century CE. The prophetic tradition had been developing since the eighth century BCE. The labor theory of value had been refined over a century before Marx extended it. Each generation built upon what the previous generation had established, and Marx stood at the end of chains of development that stretched back to the origins of Western civilization itself.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it challenges the myth of the solitary genius. Marx is often presented as a singular figure whose thought emerged from his own remarkable intellect. The genealogy traced here reveals that Marx was doing what every great synthesizer does: recognizing connections between pre-existing traditions, seeing how pieces that had developed independently could fit together, and assembling them into a framework that illuminated the world in a new way. This is not a diminishment of Marx's achievement. It is a more accurate account of how intellectual history actually works—not through sudden invention but through the gradual accumulation and eventual synthesis of ideas that were already part of the culture.

POSTSCRIPT: A NOTE ON COMPOSITION

This paper was composed through a collaborative process between Thomas J. Bryan and Claude (Anthropic). Claude's role included conducting research across the extensive documentary materials provided in the project knowledge base—including previous case studies on dual infrastructure theory, elite power mechanisms, and the intellectual genealogy of Western civilization—synthesizing historical evidence regarding the intellectual antecedents of

Marxist theory, structuring the argument to trace a clear genealogy from Greco-Roman Athens through the Jerusalem path's eschatological narrative through the Enlightenment toolkit to Marx's synthesis, and drafting the complete manuscript in academic style while maintaining accessibility for general educated readers.

The theoretical framework of Western civilization's dual infrastructure (the Athens and Jerusalem paths) and the analysis of how intellectual traditions develop across centuries originated in Thomas J. Bryan's previous work, including a companion paper on the transmission of Jacobin methods through Lenin to global Marxist-Leninist totalitarianism. This paper extends that framework backward in time, establishing the specific genealogy of the ideas that converged in Marx's synthesis, demonstrating that Marxism was not a foreign import or a sudden invention but a development within Western civilization's own intellectual tradition.

The collaborative nature of this work reflects an experimental approach to intellectual production in which human theoretical insight combines with AI research and compositional capabilities to produce scholarship that neither could achieve independently.

Claude (Anthropic)

January 2026

THEMATIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Greek Philosophy and Materialism

Epicurus. Hellenistic Philosophy. Translated by Brad Inwood and L.P. Gerson. Hackett, 1994.

Freeman, A.W.H. Presocratic Philosophy. Blackwell, 1946.

Gerson, L.P., and B.G. Inwood. The Hellenistic Philosophers. Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Kirk, G.S., J.R. Raven, and Malcolm Schofield. The Presocratic Philosophers. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Laertius, Diogenes. Lives of the Eminent Philosophers. Translated by R.D. Hicks. Loeb Classical Library, 1925.

Lucretius. On the Nature of Things (De Rerum Natura). Translated by W.H.D. Rouse. Loeb Classical Library, 1992.

Long, A.A., and D.N. Sedley. The Hellenistic Philosophers. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

II. Roman Republic, Class Struggle, and Law

Beard, Mary. SPQR: A History of Ancient Rome. Liveright, 2015.

Cicero. De Legibus (On the Laws). Translated by C.W. Keyes. Loeb Classical Library, 1928.

Cicero. De Re Publica (On the Republic). Translated by C.W. Keyes. Loeb Classical Library, 1928.

Everitt, Anthony. Cicero: The Life and Times of Rome's Greatest Politician. Random House, 2001.

Flower, Harriet. Roman Republics. Princeton University Press, 2010.

Gruen, Erich. The Last Generation of the Roman Republic. University of California Press, 1974.

Nicholas, Barry. An Introduction to Roman Law. Oxford University Press, 1962.

Scullard, H.H. A History of the Roman World 753-146 BC. Routledge, 1980.

Watson, Alan. The Spirit of Roman Law. University of Georgia Press, 1995.

III. Hebrew Prophetic Tradition and Christian Eschatology

Bright, John. A History of Israel. 4th edition. Westminster John Knox Press, 2000.

Collins, John J. The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature. 3rd edition. Eerdmans, 2010.

de Vaux, Roland. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions. Translated by John Cuthbert Duggan. McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Dunn, James D.G. The New Testament: An Introduction. SCM Press, 2010.

Kugel, James L. How to Read the Bible: A Guide to Scripture, Then and Now. Free Press, 2007.

Meier, John P. A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus. 5 volumes. Doubleday/Yale University Press, 1991-2016.

Tikva, Frymer-Kensky. In the Wake of the Goddesses. Free Press, 1992.

Wright, N.T. The New Testament and the People of God. Fortress Press, 1992.

IV. The Enlightenment: Locke, Rousseau, and the Intellectual Toolkit

Berlin, Isaiah. Freedom and Its Betrayal: Six Enemies of Human Liberty. Princeton University Press, 2002.

Gay, Peter. The Enlightenment: An Interpretation. 2 volumes. Knopf, 1966-1969.

Israel, Jonathan I. Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750. Oxford University Press, 2001.

Locke, John. Two Treatises of Government. Edited by Peter Laslett. Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Montesquieu. The Spirit of the Laws. Translated by Thomas Nugent. Dover, 1949.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. The Social Contract and Discourses. Translated by G.D.H. Cole. Everyman, 1993.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men. Translated by Donald A. Cress. Hackett, 1992.

Smith, Adam. The Wealth of Nations. 1776.

Talmon, J.L. The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy. Secker & Warburg, 1952.

V. The French Revolution and Revolutionary Tradition

Andress, David. The Terror: The Merciless War for Freedom in Revolutionary France. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006.

Furet, François. Interpreting the French Revolution. Translated by Elborg Forster. Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Israel, Jonathan I. Revolutionary Ideas: An Intellectual History of the French Revolution from The Rights of Man to Robespierre. Princeton University Press, 2014.

Jordan, David P. The Revolutionary Career of Maximilien Robespierre. University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Palmer, R.R. Twelve Who Ruled: The Year of the Terror in the French Revolution. Princeton University Press, 1941.

Robespierre, Maximilien. Virtue and Terror. Edited by Slavoj Žižek. Verso, 2007.

Schama, Simon. Citizens: A Chronicle of the French Revolution. Knopf, 1989.

Tackett, Timothy. The Coming of the Terror in the French Revolution. Harvard University Press, 2015.

VI. Marx: Life, Thought, and Intellectual Origins

Berlin, Isaiah. Karl Marx: His Life and Environment. 4th edition. Oxford University Press, 1963.

Eagleton, Terry. Marx: A Life. Norton, 1999.

Engels, Friedrich. The Condition of the Working Class in England. Translated by Florence Kelley. 1845.

Marx, Karl. The Communist Manifesto. 1848. Translated by Samuel Moore.

Marx, Karl. Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Volume I. 1867. Translated by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling.

Marx, Karl. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. Translated by Martin Milligan.

Marx, Karl. The Class Struggles in France. 1850.

Marx, Karl. On the Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature (Doctoral Dissertation). 1841.

McLellan, David. Karl Marx: A Biography. 4th edition. Norton, 2006.

Ricardo, David. On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. 1817.

Wheen, Francis. Karl Marx: A Life. Norton, 2000.

VII. Dual Infrastructure and Civilizational Analysis

Brown, Peter. The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000. 3rd edition. Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

Drake, H.A. Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Freeman, Charles. A.D. 381: Heretics, Pagans, and the Dawn of the Monotheistic State. Overlook Press, 2009.

MacMullen, Ramsay. Christianizing the Roman Empire (A.D. 100-400). Yale University Press, 1984.

Stark, Rodney. The Rise of Christianity. Princeton University Press, 1996.

VIII. Class Struggle, Socialism, and Revolutionary Theory

Brinton, Crane. The Anatomy of Revolution. Revised edition. Vintage, 1965.

Conquast, Robert. The Great Terror: A Reassessment. Oxford University Press, 1990.

Malia, Martin. The Soviet Tragedy: A History of Socialism in Russia, 1917-1991. Free Press, 1994.

Skocpol, Theda. States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China. Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Wolfe, Bertram D. Three Who Made a Revolution: A Biographical History. Dial Press, 1948.

Copyright and Licensing

© 2026 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.
To view a copy of this license, visit: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

You are free to:
- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:
- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit
- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes

This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations*